DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 238 352 HE 016 890

AUTHOR	Frusciano, Thomas J.
TITLE	Student Deferment and the Selective Service College Qualification Test, 1951-1967. Research Memorandum.
INSTITUTION	Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J.
REPORT NO	ETS-RM-83-1
PUB DATE	Nov 80
NOTE	70p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Educational Testing Service, Princeton, NJ 08541.
PUB TYPE	Historical Materials (060) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Aptitude Tests; *Armed Forces; *College Students; Higher Education; *Military Service; *Public Policy; *Screening Tests
IDENTIFIERS	Draft; *Selective Service

ABSTRACT

The history of military manpower policy and college student deferment is reviewed, with attention to the Selective Service College Qualification Test (SSCQT). By passage of the Selective Service Act of 1948, Congress recognized the need to maintain an adequate number of scientific, professional, and specialized personnel in both civilian and military pursuits. A student deferment plan was proposed whereby candidates could qualify to continue their education on the basis of class standing or a specified score on a nationally-administered educational aptitude test. In the fall of 1950, the Selective Service System contracted with Educational Testing Service (ETS) for the development of the SSCQT, a 150-item examination measuring a student's verbal and mathematical ability. The student deferment plan had vocal proponents and opponents. From 1951 to 1954, ETS tested over 500,000 students and conducted a statistical analysis program to supply the Selective Service System with information needed to operate the testing program. The SSCQT was operated by Science Research Associates for about 6 years. The Vietnam War and related anti-war and anti-draft movements renewed public debate over military manpower policy in the mid-1960s. In 1973 Congress replaced the Selective Service System with an all-volunteer army. A selected bibliography is provided. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

RM-83-1

ED238352

RESEARCH MEMORANDUM

STUDENT DEFERMENT AND THE SELECTIVE SERVICE COLLEGE QUALIFICATION TEST 1951-1967

Thomas J. Frusciano

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ETS

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

HE016290

Educational Testing Service
Princeton, New Jersey

STUDENT DEFERMENT AND THE SELECTIVE SERVICE COLLEGE QUALIFICATION TEST 1951-1967

Thomas J. Frusciano

Educational Testing Service
ETS Archives
Princeton, New Jersey
November 1980

Copyright © 1983. Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.

ABSTRACT

Traditionally, the United States has relied upon volunteers for its military manpower requirements during peacetime, with professional forces being augmented by militia, reserves, and conscripts in time of war. Congress first authorized peacetime conscription in 1940 in response to the threat of war. During the post-World War II period, Congress considered universal military training (UMT) and selective conscription as alternative methods of supplying future military manpower. Despite strong support from a large segment of the American public, and the recommendations of a presidential commission, Congress rejected UMT in favor of the Selective Service System.

By passage of the Selective Service Act of 1948, Congress recognized the need to maintain an adequate number of scientific, professional, and specialized personnel in both civilian and military pursuits. Subsequently, Selective Service Director Lewis B. Hershey proposed a student deferment plan whereby candidates qualified to continue their education on the basis of class standing or a specified score on a nationally-administered educational aptitude test. In the fall of 1950, Selective Service contracted with Educational Testing Service (ETS) for the development and administration of the Selective Service College Qualification Test (SSCQT), a 150-item examination measuring a student's verbal and mathematical ability.

On March 31, 1951, President Truman approved Hershey's student deferment plan by executive order and a storm of protest soon followed. James B. Conant, President of Harvard University and principal spokesman for the Committee on the Present Danger, led the attack by declaring the program "undemocratic" and

advocating universal military service in its place. Proponents of the Hershey plan, including the American Council on Education, the U.S. Office of Education, the Selective Service System, and ETS sought to increase public understanding of the program to gain congressional support. In June 1951, Congress passed and President Truman signed the Universal Military Training and Service Act, signifying congressional and executive approval of the use of tests as a basis for student deferment.

From 1951 to 1954, ETS tested over 500,000 students in the first four series of SSCQT administrations. It also conducted a thorough statistical analysis program in order to supply the Selective Service System with information needed to operate the testing program. Science Research Associates (SRA), in competitive bidding against ETS, received the SSCQT contract in 1954 and conducted the program through 1958. The program switched back to ETS for SSCQT administrations from 1959 to 1962; to SRA for 1963; and then was suspended by Selective Service. In 1966, as a result of military escalation in Vietnam, General Hershey reinstated the SSCQT as a criterion in determining student deferments. SRA administered the test in the spring of 1966 and ETS conducted the last administrations in the fall of 1966 and the spring of 1967.

The Vietnam War and related anti-war and anti-draft movements renewed public debate over military manpower policy in the mid-1960s. Congress extended Selective Service by passing the Military Selective Service Act in 1967 and President Johnson ordered blanket deferments for all undergraduate students. Student deferments were terminated by President Nixon in December 1971. In 1973, Congress replaced the Selective Service System with an all-volunteer army, suspending the persistent debate over military conscription and student deferment policy until 1980.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many individuals contributed to this report and I would like to express my appreciation to them: Mary Ann Sumner and Adrienne Richter, who located and acquired a number of resources for this study; Mary and John Murrin, who read an early draft and offered suggestions on content and style; Estelle Bartels, for her editorial assistance; and Veronica Morris and her staff, for text processing services. I would also like to thank the following individuals for reviewing the report: Robert F. Boldt, Richard Coley, Katharine Denby, Elizabeth Ireland, Stephen F. Klein, Louis R. Lavine, Gary Marco, William B. Schrader, and Janet Williams.

I am especially grateful to my colleague and friend, Gary Saretzky. His contributions were substantial, and his support for this project is indicative of his concern for ETS history.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

I. ORIGINS OF THE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM 2

Universal Military Training and Selective Service 5

II. MILITARY MANPOWER POLICY AND STUDENT DEFERMENT 8

The Trytten Report 11

ETS Involvement Begins 13

Planning the Draft Deferment Test 17

Deferment Debate Continues 20

Deferment Plan Announced 22

III. THE STUDENT DEFERMENT PLAN AND THE PUBLIC'S REACTION 24

James B. Conant vs. Selective Service..... 24

Passage of the Universal Military Training and Service Act 29

IV. THE SELECTIVE SERVICE COLLEGE QUALIFICATION TEST (SSCQT) ... 31

Scaling and Equating the Test 31

Test Administration and National Results: First Series, May-July, 1951 35

SSCQT, 1951-1954 38

Science Research Associates and the SSCQT, 1954-1958 .. 43

ETS and the SSCQT, 1959-1962 44

SSCQT Reinstated, 1966-1967 45

Scaling the SSCQT, 1966 47

SSCQT Results, 1966-1967..... 48

V. STUDENT DEFERMENT AND SELECTIVE SERVICE, 1967-1973..... 51

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY 55

TABLES

1. SSCQT EXPERIMENTAL FORM ZVN 32

2. COMPARABLE SELECTIVE SERVICE COLLEGE QUALIFICATION TEST SCORES AND ARMY GENERAL CLASSIFICATION TEST SCORES 34

3. SSCQT: FIRST SERIES RESULTS, 1951 35

4. STUDENT DEFERMENT ELIGIBILITY, FALL 1951 38

5. SSCQT: SECOND SERIES RESULTS, 1951-1952 40

6. SSCQT: THIRD SERIES RESULTS, 1952-1953 42

7. SSCQT: FOURTH SERIES RESULTS, 1953-1954 42

8. SSCQT RESULTS, 1959-1962 45

9. SSCQT RESULTS, FALL 1966 48

10. SSCQT RESULTS, SPRING 1967 49

YOUTH AND THE DRAFT, April 8, 1951. Discussing the Selective Service System student deferment program are from left to right: George Campbell, commentator, Henry Chauncey, President of Educational Testing Service, Arthur S. Adams, President of the American Council on Education, and Major General Lewis B. Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System.

STUDENT DEFERMENT AND THE SELECTIVE SERVICE COLLEGE QUALIFICATION TEST

Introduction

"As a national nonprofit organization, ETS should be concerned with the needs of government, particularly of the federal government, and most broadly in times of national emergency," asserted Henry Chauncey, President of Educational Testing Service (ETS), in the 1949 ETS Annual Report.[1] The nation faced such an emergency in 1950 when the outbreak of the Korean War called for immediate mobilization of manpower and heightened awareness of the need for increased commitment to military preparedness. To meet the manpower demand, the President and Congress called upon the Selective Service System to supply the military with sufficient troops, while simultaneously providing for a continuing flow of highly trained civilians into scientific and technical fields. After lengthy debate and deliberation, Selective Service designed a student deferment program that would permit students who demonstrated a certain level of scholastic aptitude to continue their education. It turned to ETS for help in identifying these students. The result, the Selective Service College Qualification Test (SSCQT), was consistent with Chauncey's objectives for ETS.

---

[1]Educational Testing Service, Annual Report to the Board of Trustees, 1949-1950 (Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1950), p. 14.

I. ORIGINS OF THE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Traditionally, the United States has relied upon volunteers to provide military manpower during peacetime, with professional forces being augmented by militia, reserves, and conscripts in time of war. Conscription in peacetime did not occur until Congress passed the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940.

The early English colonists brought with them the militia concept, although the degree of obligation for each citizen varied from colony to colony. During the Revolutionary War, voluntary procurement of men for the armed forces proved to be inadequate given the requirements of the Continental Army, and General Washington requested that the Continental Congress authorize conscription in all the states. No action was taken, and the war ended without the implementation of any such system. Congress considered a similar system of conscription during the War of 1812, but again the idea was discarded and the military had to rely upon state militias to meet its manpower needs.[2]

During the early years of the Civil War, both the North and the South found it necessary to resort to conscription. The Confederacy began conscription in 1862, drafting men for one year of service. The Union soon followed with the Enrollment Acts of 1863, which drafted men for a period

---

[2]U.S. Selective Service System, Outline of Historical Background of Selective Service and Chronology (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1952), pp. 1-6; Harry A. Marmion, "Historical Background of Selective Service in the United States," in Roger W. Little, ed., Selective Service and American Society (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1969), pp. 35-52.

of three to nine months' service. But this attempt at formal military conscription was a significant failure, largely because it was poorly conceived and administered. Exemptions were frequent, especially in the North where a man could either purchase one for $300 or pay someone to serve his term. The draft system fell most heavily upon the poor; its inequities produced riots in a number of large Northern cities. The July 1863 riot in New York City was the most serious; several hundred people were killed or wounded, and property damage was estimated at one million dollars.

Following the Civil War, the nation relied upon volunteers for its military manpower until World War I. In 1917, military conscription once again emerged as the method for supplying manpower in time of war for the armed forces of the United States.

The Selective Service Act of 1917 was passed by Congress only after a lengthy and acrimonious debate. The Act, signed by President Wilson on May 18, authorized the establishment of local boards to consider and determine all questions of exemption. On June 5, Selective Service personnel registered 10 million men. A central lottery in Washington, D.C. established the order of selection, and the first drawing was held on July 20, 1917. The system functioned smoothly, and almost three million men were selected and inducted into the armed forces between the first lottery drawing and the end of World War I.[3]

Between 1926 and 1940, the Joint Army and Navy Selective Service Committee convened to study, revise, and draft a Selective Service law for future emergencies.

---

[3] Outline of Historical Background of Selective Service and Chronology, pp. 7-8.

In the summer of 1940, but not without strenuous debate, Congress finally passed the Selective Training and Service Act, and established a Selective Service national headquarters. Later in the year, President Roosevelt appointed Dr. Clarence Dykstra, President of the University of Wisconsin, to be the first Director of the Selective Service System. He served only six months before he resigned and was replaced in July 1941 by Lewis B. Hershey, who directed the System until 1970.

The Selective Service Training and Service Act of 1940 required all males between the ages of 21 and 35 to register with local draft boards, and once again, a lottery was used to select men who would be trained and serve. The original Act initially set the period of service at one year but, in August of 1941, new legislation extended it to 18 months. After the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, Congress extended the term of service through the duration of the war and six months thereafter. Additional modifications due to the exigencies of World War II included the expansion of the age limits for induction and the reduction of categories and standards for exemption from military service. During the period of emergency from November 1940 to October 1946, more than 10 million men were inducted into the armed forces.

Following President Truman's recommendation, Congress allowed the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 to expire in March 1947, after which the armed forces, for a year, had to depend solely upon voluntary enlistments to fill its manpower requirements. Congress did, however, establish the Office of Selective Service Records, to maintain records, data, and files on the Selective Service process, and General Hershey was named director of the Office.[4]

---

4 Ibid., pp. 9-15.

Universal Military Training and Selective Service

As a replacement for the Selective Training and Service Act, Truman tried unsuccessfully for four years to have Congress pass a Universal Military Training Act that would provide one year of training for all men. President Roosevelt had considered a similar plan early in 1940, and later called for universal military training (UMT) as an "esssential factor in the maintenance of peace in the future," in his State of the Union message in January 1945. But his plan for compulsory national service met severe opposition by some religious organizations, labor unions, farmers, ad hoc citizens groups, and particularly, by college and university administrators who, because of the impact of defense and manpower policies on their institutions, took an active role in the ensuing national debate.[5]

The educators' major argument centered on the need for a comprehensive approach to national security, while UMT was viewed as a one-track program that should be avoided. Prominent university presidents such as Donald Tresidder of Stanford, Harold Dodds of Princeton, James B. Conant of Harvard, and Robert Hutchins of Chicago all agreed that the President needed to appoint a commission to study all phases and aspects of manpower policy and national security, including Selective Service and UMT. Truman appointed the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training in December of 1946 and named Karl Compton, president of MIT, as chairman. In May 1947, the Compton Commission issued its final report, A Program for National Security, which stressed the need for universal military training.

---

[5]David L. Marden, "The Cold War and American Education" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Kansas, 1975), II, pp. 359-399; James B. Conant, My Several Lives: Memoirs of a Social Inventor (New York: Harper and Row, 1970), pp. 351-357.

The Compton Commission specifically recommended six months of universal military training for all 18-year-old males, and enlistment in a National Guard or Reserve Force thereafter, with advanced education and training in various specialities as an alternative to the added military obligation. The Commission and other proponents argued that UMT would provide a trained pool of reserves that would improve both the alertness and quality of the regular armed forces. It seemed to satisfy the philosophical requirements of the American political system--it was universal, uniform, and therefore democratic; the social mix would promote a sense of national unity and fellowship among trainees from diverse backgrounds.

But its opponents declared UMT unnecessary because the atomic age had made sheer manpower in the military obsolete. Some argued that six months of training did not a soldier make, the plan was prohibitively expensive, and it would be a precursor of regimentation and militarism in the United States. The Compton Report, according to historian David Marden, "crystallized educational opposition to UMT by fostering a sense of urgency." Educators viewed the plan as a potential cause of major disruptions in the educational process and an impediment to career advancement of the trainees. But the predominant criticism leveled at the Compton Commission was that both its focus and conclusions were too narrow.[6]

---

[6]A Program for National Security: Report of the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1947), pp. 88-95; John Graham, "Military Conscription in the United States -- Proposals, Issues, Legislation: An Historical Survey" (paper presented to the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service, Washington, D.C., October 6, 1966); Marden, "Cold War and American Education," pp. 381-392; Conant, My Several Lives, p. 520.

In the fall of 1947, enlistments into the armed forces declined substantially. But in February 1948, tension heightened between the United States and the Soviet Union as a result of the Berlin crisis and the Communist coup d'etat in Czechoslovakia. President Truman delivered a stern denunciation of Soviet aggression in Eastern Europe to a joint session of Congress on March 17, 1948. In the same message he called for enactment of the Compton Commission recommendations on universal military training and a temporary Selective Service Act in order to strengthen American defenses in Europe.[7] Although Congress failed to enact legislation for UMT, it did enact a Selective Service law. The Selective Service Act of 1948 was signed on June 24, 1948, mandating peacetime induction of civilians into military service.

The provisions of the Selective Service Act of 1948 were similar to the World War II legislation. All males between the ages of 18 and 26 were required to register; however, the period of service was extended from 18 to 21 months. Men in the 18-year-old category were given one year to decide whether to enlist or join the Reserves, thereby avoiding the draft. The law also permitted high school students to continue their studies until graduation or until they reached the age of 20, whichever came first. College and university students could have their induction postponed until the end of the academic year. The Act, authorized the President to issue deferment regulations for those persons whose activity was found essential to the national interest. Approximately 30,000 men were inducted by January 1949, when enlistments provided adequate manpower to the armed forces and all draft calls ceased.

---

[7]U.S. President, Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States (Washington, D.C.: Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Service, 1953-), Harry S. Truman, 1948, pp. 182-186.

II. MILITARY MANPOWER POLICY AND STUDENT DEFERMENT

Although the United States has always shown considerable concern for its military strength, particularly with regard to manpower levels, the problem of student deferment from military service did not receive serious attention until World War I. In 1917, Congress established the Student Army Training Corps to allow youths under the age of 21 to be relieved from active military service in order to attend college for three years. Approximately 143,000 students participated in this program at more than 500 colleges around the country. But before these first enrollees matriculated, Congress lowered the draft age from 21 to 18 and reduced the period of college instruction for these students to nine months. The first students were inducted in October of 1918, but the Armistice was signed in November and all trainees were demobilized before the end of the year. The life of the Student Army Training Corps was short, but it established a precedent for some form of student deferment.[8]

The Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 provided for deferment of persons engaged in employment or activity deemed necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest. College students were eligible, and, by the end of 1941, more than 100,000 students had been deferred. As the war proceeded and the manpower supply diminished, Selective Service placed restrictions on student deferments. Students preparing or training for critical occupations in essential industries, such as engineering, chemistry, physics,

---

[8]Marmion, "Historical Background of Selective Service," pp. 39-40.

and health fields were generally deferred. Students in other fields were not, and by 1943-44, the civilian male enrollment in colleges and universities dropped to about 30 percent of the 1939-40 base figure.[9]

In establishing the Selective Service Act of 1948, Congress declared that "in a free society the obligations and privileges of serving in the armed forces and the reserve components thereof should be shared generally in accordance with a system of selection which is fair and just, and which is consistent with the maintenance of an effective national economy." It further asserted that:

> ". . . adequate provision for national security requires maximum effort in the fields of scientific research and development, and the fullest possible utilization of the nation's technological, scientific, and other critical manpower resources."[10]

Although the Selective Service Act of 1948 provided for the withdrawal of large numbers of men from their civilian pursuits, it offered only general guidelines for the implementation of military manpower policy. The establishment of specific deferment regulations was left to the President.

Manpower policy had always been based on what was viewed as "essential" to the war effort. During World War II, decisions concerning who should serve in the armed forces were made by local draft boards and were based on an assessment

---

[9]U.S. Bureau of the Census, Historical Statistics of the United States, Colonial Times to 1970, Bicentennial Edition, Part 1 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975), p. 383; National Manpower Council, Student Deferment and National Manpower Policy (New York: Columbia University Press, 1952), pp. 25-26.

[10]U.S. Congress, House, The Selective Service Act of 1948, Public Law 80-759, 80th Cong., 1st sess., H.R. 6401, 1948, p. 1; also quoted in M. H. Trytten, Student Deferment in Selective Service: A Vital Factor in National Security (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1952), p. 8.

of each individual's potential contribution to the nation's defense. In the postwar years, this formula was not applicable. The policy of peacetime conscription presented new problems. The President assigned two administrative agencies the task of studying the manpower situation and advising him on deferment policy: the National Security Resources Board (NSRB), established by Truman and authorized by Congress under the National Security Act of 1947 to review and recommend manpower policy, and the Selective Service System, which was responsible for making all policy recommendations operational.

In response to the President's request, Selective Service Director Hershey, with the concurrence of the NSRB, appointed six Scientific Advisory Committees on August 20, 1948, "to advise me on the whole problem in general in the fixing of policies in order that we may classify individuals concerned to the best interest of the national economy and the health, safety and interest of the Nation."[11] The Committees consisted of educators and scientists and were grouped under the following titles: Agricultural and Biological Sciences, Engineering Sciences, Healing Arts, Humanities, Physical Sciences, and Social Sciences. Under the chairmanship of Dr. M. H. Trytten, Director of the Office of Scientific Personnel, National Research Council, the six Committees submitted their recommendations on student deferment policy to General Hershey in December 1948. Inductions into the armed forces under Selective Service ceased after January 1949, however, lessening the urgency of the manpower problem. The Trytten Committees' report did not receive further

---

[11]Quoted in letter, M. H. Trytten to Major General Lewis B. Hershey, December 1, 1950, copy in ETS Archives, Selective Service College Qualification Test Papers, TP/2A12 (hereafter cited as SSCQT Papers), Box 1, Folder 1.

official attention until the outbreak of the Korean War in June of 1950 when, in response to the new crisis, the United States had to make some crucial decisions about military manpower policy.

The Trytten Report

The Trytten Committees reconvened in the fall of 1950 to review their original recommendations; their final report on student deferment was resubmitted to General Hershey in December and was published shortly thereafter. In reaching their conclusions, the Committees considered, but rejected, several alternative proposals. Responding to the idea of deferring all college students from military service, the Committees agreed that any plan adopted by Selective Service "should be capable of ready adjustment to make possible the induction of larger and larger numbers of the student age groups in case of increasing emergency." The proposal for deferring all students was regarded as "inflexible and unrealistic and, therefore, impractical." To the opposite argument that no students should be deferred from the armed forces, the Committees responded that such a proposal "would lead to a serious hiatus in the continuing supply of critically needed specialized personnel and thus constitutes . . . great danger to the national security . . . ."

The Committees also rejected the recommendation that only those students preparing for "essential" sciences and professions be permitted to continue their studies, arguing that these "essential" sciences and professions were not easily identified. "It is quite possible that fifteen years ago nuclear physicists would have been dismissed as a scientific luxury -- as a group of theoreticians not essential to the national defense. The professor of Japanese language and literature who served in combat intelligence during World War II

would certainly have been viewed earlier as a luxury." Furthermore, according to the Committees' report, most students who entered their freshman year in college did not know which science, profession, or special field they were best qualified to study. ". . . college students in the first and second years can rarely be expected to make intelligent choices among special fields. There is little reason to believe that university authorities can choose for them."

The Trytten Committees' recommendations centered on the need for selective deferment of college students. Their report stated that ". . . modern nations, to survive in peace or war, must have an adequate number of scientific, professional and specialized personnel in both civilian and military pursuits. Therefore, suitable steps must be taken to recruit, train and maintain in professional activity an adequate flow of competent individuals." They urged that a special classification (II-S) be established under Selective Service regulations for registrants whose "demonstrated educational aptitude" warranted the continuation of their training program. Educational aptitude would be identified by a specified minimum score on a general classification test and evidence of previous educational accomplishment.

More specifically, the Committees recommended that a student achieve a score on an aptitude test equivalent to a score of 120 or above on the Army General Classification Test (AGCT), which had been administered to military personnel during World War II. Each student also would have to be certified by an accredited school, college, or university as showing promise of definite progress in higher education. Certificates would be issued to those students whose rank in class among other students eligible for induction into the armed

forces was above a rank set by the director of Selective Service. The Committees also recommended that an advisory board be appointed by Selective Service to monitor the program and make policy recommendations concerning distribution of trained personnel in relation to changing needs of essential civilian and military services. Finally, the Committees urged "in the strongest possible terms," that the director of Selective Service recommend a government scholarship program for all students qualifying for deferment on the basis of "demonstrated educational aptitude." 12

ETS Involvement Begins

Trytten had appointed a subcommittee consisting of civilian and military psychologists to recommend to the six Scientific Advisory Committees specifications for the aptitude test and to consider agencies best suited for administering a national testing program. Meeting in Washington, D.C., on September 27, 1950, the subcommittee "reached a unanimous decision with respect to the two responsibilities." They agreed that the aptitude test used in the student deferment program would contain the following specifications:

> It would yield a single composite score weighted about equally with verbal (linguistic) and numerical (quantitative) abilities; it would be composed of items selected for maximum validity in predicting general college achievement; it would have a reliability of at least .90 for the college student population; it would have a sufficiently ample time limit so that it was not primarily a speed test; it would require the minimum time consonant with the above

---

12"Report to the Director of the Selective Service System by the Six Committees on Scientific, Professional and Specialized Personnel," attachment to letter, Trytten to Hershey, December 1, 1950, copy in ETS Archives, SSCQT Papers, Box 1, Folder 1. The report is also included as an appendix to Trytten, Student Deferment in Selective Service, pp. 81-93.

reliability; it would consist of items with reasonable face-validity; it would yield scores equivalent to the Army General Classification Test, i.e. national median of 100 and standard deviation of 20; it would be maximally discriminative at an initially proposed cutting score of 120; and it would be developed in a number of equivalent forms for continuing usage.

The subcommittee recommended that General Hershey negotiate a contract with Educational Testing Service (ETS) for development of the test, since its involvement in admissions testing, and its "effective collaboration" in the development and administration of aptitude tests for the military service made ETS "the best qualified agency to undertake the development of this aptitude test and the administration of the test to college students throughout the nation." 13

The whole issue of student deferment and Selective Service had been closely followed at ETS, at least since the passage of the Selective Service Act of 1948. When news began circulating about the possible use of an aptitude test as a criterion for student deferment, ETS President Henry Chauncey wrote to James C. O'Brien, Director of the Manpower Division of the National Security Resources Board, outlining the various testing programs conducted by the College Entrance Examination Board during World War II and the existing programs

---

13"Report of Sub-Committee to Recommend Aptitude Test and Administrative Arrangements for Its Use in Deferment of College Students," September 27, 1950, attachment to letter, M. H. Trytten to Henry Chauncey, October 17, 1950, ETS Archives, Henry Chauncey Papers, GA/C3, Box 83, Folder 869.

The subcommittee members included Donald Baier, Adjutant General's Office, Department of the Army; Walter V. Bingham, Professor of Psychology at Carnegie Institute of Technology; Leonard Carmichael, President of Tufts College and a member of the ETS Standing Committee on Research; Dael Wolfle, American Association for the Advancement of Science; and E. Lowell Kelly, Professor of Psychology at the University of Michigan and a member of the Selective Service Scientific Advisory Committee in the Social Sciences.

administered by ETS, which assumed responsibility for the College Board testing programs in January of 1948.[14] These programs included several selection programs for specific branches of the armed forces. For example, during World War II, the College Board had administered the screening test used in the selection of students for the Army Specialized Training Program (A-12) and screening and achievement tests for the Navy College Training Program (V-12). While talks on military manpower continued, ETS was engaged in administering the screening test for the NROTC Program (Holloway Plan), a program similar to the A-12 and V-12 testing in all major aspects but one: the tests were taken at 600 supervised testing centers. Candidates registered for the test in advance and were assigned to the most convenient center. This feature of test administration appeared to be well suited for the proposed Selective Service program.

On February 16, 1949, Chauncey, at the invitation of Trytten, attended a meeting of the Scientific Advisory Committee in the Physical Sciences, one of the six Trytten Committees. The Committee had agreed that the student deferment program must include, not military classification tests, but "similar tests to be prepared and administered by a separate (probably non-government) agency." ETS was one agency being seriously considered for the program. During the meeting, when discussion turned to financing the program, Selective Service officials asserted that it was questionable whether the government would be able to support a program of this size and suggested that students themselves pay to

---

[14]Letter, Chauncey to James C. O'Brien, October 19, 1948; O'Brien to Chauncey, November 12, 1948, Henry Chauncey Papers, Box 79, Folder 834.

take the deferment test. The Physical Sciences Committee "vigorously objected" to the possibility.[15] Chauncey later indicated to Committee chairman Roswell C. Gibbs that ETS might be unwilling to participate in the program if students were required to pay an examination fee. He felt there would be enough public concern about the use of tests to determine whether a student continued his education or was drafted into the armed forces, and a financial obligation on the part of the candidates would only discriminate against those who were less able or less willing to pay to take the test. In Chauncey's view, personal finances should not be made a factor in deciding whether a student would be deferred or serve in the army.[16]

While General Hershey was considering the recommendations of the Trytten Committees, the debate over student deferment focused upon two other plans.

The Thomas Plan: In December 1950, the chairman of the NSRB appointed the Scientific Manpower Advisory Committee, under the leadership of Charles A. Thomas, to consider manpower policy. The Thomas Committee proposed that all qualified 18-year-old males engage in four months of military training. High school students would be deferred until graduation or age 19, whichever came first. Following this period of training some men would be selected through competitive examination for college enrollment in a Reserve Specialist Training

---

[15]"Minutes of the Meeting of the Selective Service Committee in the Physical Sciences" (February 16, 1949), attached to letter, R. C. Gibbs to Chauncey, February 24, 1949, Henry Chauncey Papers, Box 77, Folder 815; see also Henry Chauncey, "Memorandum of Selective Service Committee in the Physical Sciences, February 16, 1949" (February 21, 1949), Henry Chauncey Papers, Box 83, Folder 869.

[16]Letter, Chauncey to Roswell C. Gibbs, March 7, 1949, Henry Chauncey Papers, Box 77, Folder 815; Henry Chauncey, Oral History Interview, VI, November 8, 1977, ETS Archives Oral History Program, p. 6.

Corps (RSTC). After graduation these men would be available for either civilian or military service considered essential to the national interest.

Defense Department Plan: In January 1951, the Department of Defense submitted its own deferment plan that relied heavily upon the Thomas Committee recommendations. According to the Department's plan, a number of carefully selected men would, after completing a period of basic training, be temporarily relieved from active duty to attend college. Seventy-five thousand students would be chosen annually by civilian agencies to study or conduct research in all fields determined to be in the national interest. This plan also requested consideration of implementing a national scholarship program to aid those selected men unable to afford the cost of college; it further suggested that those who chose to work their way through school be given up to six years to complete their course of study.[17]

Planning for the Draft Deferment Test

While Congress was preparing to argue the merits of Selective Service, UMT, and student and occupational deferment policy, General Hershey made preliminary arrangements for a nationwide testing program. As of the fall of 1950, Selective Service estimated that one million college and high school

---

[17]Congressional committee hearings and reports on the Thomas Committee and Defense Department proposals are in U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Armed Services, Preparedness Subcommittee, Universal Military Training and Service Act of 1951, Hearings, 82d Cong., 1st sess., 1951, pp. 816-837; U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Armed Services, Universal Military Training and Service Act, S. Rept. No. 117, Report To Accompany S.1, 82d Cong., 1st sess., 1951, pp. 41-52, 79-83; U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Armed Services, Universal Military Training, Hearings and Papers, No. 4, 82d Cong., 1st sess., 1951, pp. 43-181. Summaries of student deferment plans are in National Manpower Council, Student Deferment and National Manpower Policy, pp. 27-29 and James M. Gerhardt, The Draft and Public Policy: Issues in Military Manpower Procurement, 1945-1970 (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1971), pp. 153-157.

students, between the ages of 18 and 26, would be participating in the program. Hershey negotiated a planning contract with ETS that extended from November 13 to December 31, 1950, and provided for ETS to "make its facilities available, and to provide the necessary supplies and services, to the Selective Service System for the purpose of planning and developing a testing program designed for use in connection with the identification of college students to be considered as eligible for deferment."[18] Selective Service anticipated that final approval of the program would come by the end of December, and all plans and preparation of services, materials, and procedures moved forward on that assumption. ETS prepared test questions, conducted pretesting at Lackland Air Force Base in San Antonio, Texas, finished the first final form of the test, designed and printed answer sheets and questionnaires for supplying data for special statistical and research studies, drew up plans and procedures for scaling and equating the final forms, and developed plans to study the validity of the test. ETS also prepared materials explaining the program, such as letters to schools, colleges, and local draft boards, posters, application forms, and bulletins of information for distribution by state Selective Service headquarters. And finally, preliminary arrangements were made for the acquisition of necessary space, equipment, and supplies.[19]

ETS test development staff assembled a three-hour, 150-question educational aptitude test, equally divided between items testing verbal or linguisitic ability and items testing mathematical or quantitative reasoning ability. Four

---

[18]Memorandum, Richard H. Sullivan to Administrative Committee, November 14, 1950, ETS Archives, Administrative Committee File.

[19]"Performance Report to the Director of Selective Service on Contract SR-114," attachment to letter, Richard H. Sullivan to General Lewis B. Hershey, January 12, 1951, SSCQT Papers, Box 1, Folder 4.

types of items were chosen for their "established validity as predictors of academic achievement":[20]

Reading comprehension:	passages to be read, each followed by five or six questions
Verbal relations:	antonyms, verbal analogies, and sentence completion
Arithmetic reasoning:	short problems, including a few elementary algebra and plane geometry problems, but with necessary basic formulas provided
Data interpretation:	charts, graphs, tables, and maps, some accompanied by expository passages, each followed by seven or eight questions

On November 20 and 21, 1950, they submitted this plan to members of the ETS Tests and Measurements Committee, ETS Research Committee, and members of the test-research agencies of the armed forces, who met jointly to consider how ETS would conduct the Selective Service testing program. The committees approved the plan with slight modifications but urged that material be selected that covered the natural sciences, social sciences, humanities, and mathematics "with emphasis on interpretation and functional use rather than on factual knowledge." The committees also supported the use of a single two-digit score scale falling between zero and 100; this scale was strongly desired by Selective Service. In recommending research studies to be conducted in conjunction with the program, members of the committees emphasized the

---

[20]Warren G. Findley, "The Selective Service College Qualification Test," American Psychologist, 6, No. 5 (May 1951), pp. 181-183.

importance of selecting a reference population with which to compare the performance of groups applying for and receiving deferment on the basis of their test scores. In particular, the committees suggested studying the effects of coaching for the test, the relation of scores to background characteristics of candidates, scores achieved by various subgroups in relation to a criterion, the effects on scores of delay in test-taking, and the effects of motivation on scores on the test.[21]

When ETS's planning contract with Selective Service expired on December 31, 1950, without final approval for the testing program from the President or Congress, Hershey proposed rescheduling all deadlines so that ETS could continue test development work and also proceed with arrangements for obtaining necessary supplies. Selective Service and ETS agreed upon an extended contract to cover service from January 11 to February 9, 1951.[22]

Deferment Debate Continues

In early spring of 1951, the student deferment debate continued in both the Senate and the House of Representatives, and several plans were considered. Among them:

- Hershey's own plan on manpower policy and student deferment. This plan, largely based on the Trytten Committees' recommendations, outlined

---

[21]William W. Turnbull, "Minutes of Joint Meeting of the Committee on Tests and Measurements, Committee on Research, Educational Testing Service, November 20-21, 1950," (December 19, 1950), ETS Archives, Tests and Measurements Committee File.

[22]Letter, Chauncey to General Hershey, December 28, 1950; Colonel George A. Irwin to Chauncey, January 5, 1951, Henry Chauncey Papers, Box 83, Folders 869 and 870.

specific provisions for rank-in-class qualifications and test scores: upper-half of the class and 70 for freshmen, upper two-thirds of the class and 70 for sophomores, upper three-quarters of the class and 70 for juniors, and the upper half of the class and 75 for seniors continuing on to graduate or professional school. One major difference was the use of the test score and rank in class on an either-or basis. A student near the bottom of his class could still be deferred on the basis of his test score; a student who failed to pass the test could qualify for deferment on the basis of his class standing.[23] This new provision allowed both the highly and less selective colleges and universities to maintain an adequate flow of students. Trytten later justified this change:

> It became clear . . . that this double requirement (test score and class standing) would unduly affect certain types of institutions in such a way as possibly to defeat the intent of the program. American institutions of higher education differ materially in kind and character. Their standards of admission vary considerably. The highly selective institutions, if they were to suffer the same percentage loss of students as the less selective institutions, would not be able to turn out the same numbers of highly qualified young men as formerly, and in many cases their graduates are of considerable significance to the nation.
>
> But other reasons make it undesirable also that less selective institutions should lose too large a percentage of their students, as they might if the aptitude criterion were made absolute. These schools serve an important social and training purpose for their clientele and their region. There are other values than strictly academic ones.[24]

• The Defense Department's deferment plan that had been proposed in January.

The Senate Armed Services Committee reported favorably on this plan for the

---

[23]U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Armed Services, 1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act, H. Rept. No. 271, Report to Accompany S.1, 82nd Cong., 1st sess., 1951, pp. 22-24; General Lewis B. Hershey, "Classification of College and University Students," Operations Bulletin No. 28, Selective Service System, March 30, 1951, copy in SSCQT Papers, Box 6, Folder 50.

[24]Trytten, Student Deferment in Selective Service, p. 35.

annual selection of 75,000 men for a special college program. It also specified the creation of a presidential commission to select men for the program and authorized the commission to offer scholarships as might seem appropriate.

• The House Armed Services Committee plan. The House Committee disagreed with the Defense Department proposal and, in writing its own bill, insisted on retaining the proviso of the 1948 act that left discretion regarding deferment policy to the President. The Committee also insisted on establishing the draft age at 19; the Senate had requested that it be set at 18. The differences between the Senate and House versions of the manpower proposal set the stage for a Senate-House Conference on manpower legislation.[25]

Deferment Plan Announced

On March 31, 1951, President Truman signed Executive Order No. 10230 amending the Selective Service Act of 1948 and establishing the basis for General Hershey's student deferment plan. A student who was accepted for admission to a college, university, or similar institution and was planning to pursue a full-time course of instruction, or a student who was enrolled in such a school and was satisfactorily pursuing such a course, would qualify for deferment based upon "such categories as the Director of Selective Service, with the approval of the President, may prescribe, . . . a required scholastic standing, . . . [a score] on a qualification test, or both such standing and score, to

---

[25]U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Armed Services, Universal Military Training and Service Act, S. Rept. No. 117, Report To Accompany S.1, 82d Cong., 1st sess., 1951, pp. 79-83; House, Committee on Armed Services, 1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act, H. Rept. No. 271, Report To Accompany S.1, 82d Cong., 1st sess., 1951, pp. 9-13, 20-24.

be prescribed by the Director of Selective Service with the approval of the President." The Order also authorized General Hershey "to prescribe such qualification test or tests as he may deem necessary for carrying out [the above] provisions."[26]

ETS had been preparing for the testing program for five months. On March 19, 1951, with full expectation that Truman would be signing the aforementioned order within a few days, Henry Chauncey and General Hershey signed contract SR-121, making the Selective Service testing program a reality. The contract called for ETS to administer the Selective Service College Qualification Test (SSCQT) on May 26, June 16, and June 30 to approximately one million candidates.[27] The large number of expected participants was based on the estimated number of students in high school and college who were eligible for induction into military service as of the fall of 1950. A final review of the deferment plan by Arthur Flemming's Manpower Policy Committee of the Office of Defense Mobilization resulted in the elimination of high school students from the testing program.[28] Despite this limitation, the Selective Service program became the largest testing program conducted by a civilian agency up to that time.

---

[26]U.S. President, Executive Order, "Amending the Selective Service Regulations," Federal Register, XVI, March 31, 1951, p. 2905.

[27]A fourth date, July 12, was added to accommodate candidates whose religious convictions prevented them from taking the examination on Saturday.

[28]Catherine G. Sharp, "Minutes of Administrative Committee Meeting of March 20, 1951," (March 20, 1951), ETS Archives, Administrative Committee File.

III. THE STUDENT DEFERMENT PLAN AND THE PUBLIC'S REACTION

The President's announcement of the student deferment plan aroused mixed reaction throughout the nation. Most of the criticism of the plan centered upon Selective Service policy and not on the use of the SSCQT itself. Some opponents viewed the program as undemocratic; college students were treated as a privileged class. Others saw the deferment plan as a method of creating an intellectual aristocracy within the United States. Many critics misinterpreted "deferment" as "permanent exemption," and this misconception temporarily increased the frequency of attacks on the inequity of the program. But even among those who understood the program, there were sincere opponents. Among the most ardent were the presidents of Princeton, Yale, and Harvard -- three of the highly selective institutions of higher education. President Harold Dodds of Princeton stated: "I . . . view the almost blanket deferment of college students as wrong for the nation and detrimental to the best interest of the colleges in the long run." A. Whitney Griswold of Yale favored a plan similar to the Defense Department's proposal for allowing 75,000 men to be relieved from active duty to study fields believed to be essential to the national interest.[29] The most vocal critic of the deferment program among educational leaders was James B. Conant, President of Harvard, and an ETS trustee.

James B. Conant vs. Selective Service

Conant had continually expressed his concern about manpower policies and the strength of the United States defenses in Europe throughout the war years. Although he was opposed to universal military training (UMT) when

---

[29] New York Times, April 9, 1951; also quoted in Gerhardt, The Draft and Public Policy, p. 160.

President Roosevelt introduced the idea in 1945, he declared that, if an authoritative commission found UMT "indispensable," he would support that finding. In his Education in a Divided World (1948), Conant expounded upon the serious threat posed by the Soviet Union and called for a complete review of manpower policy and, especially, Selective Service. In his view, the Selective Service Act of 1948 was "only a stop-gap." He suggested a plan for enrolling every male, when he reached eighteen or graduated from high school, in a national militia for a period of 10 years. "The local unit of the National Guard would be the medium for training, to be accomplished in three or four years of summer camp and evening drill." In 1950, following the invasion of South Korea, Conant modified his plan "to meet the new conditions." He now favored enrollment in the armed forces for service rather than enrollment in a national militia for training. In October, he prepared a memorandum to members of the Association of American Universities (AAU), setting forth his ideas about universal military service (UMS): "I doubt if anyone will question the need for increasing the size of the armed forces . . . nor challenge the statement that this process will have a forceful impact on formal education beyond the high school." Conant advocated that every male spend two to three years, between the ages of 18 and 25, in government service. Those who were physically and mentally fit would spend their time in military service; others would serve their terms in civilian government service at the same pay rate. He believed that only students studying medicine, dentistry, or engineering should have their term of service postponed, provided they committed themselves to at least four years in government service. The "Conant Plan" was published in the December 19, 1950 issue of Look under the title, "A Stern Program for Survival." By this time the AAU

had issued a resolution on "The Mobilization of Manpower" which endorsed the Conant Plan and emphasized AAU's firm opposition to the student deferment plans of Selective Service.[30]

On December 12, Conant formally announced the formation of the Committee on the Present Danger (CPD), a citizens' group that called for the adoption of universal military service (UMS), increased commitment of ground forces in Europe, and an increase in foreign aid to American allies. Conant and the CPD gathered the support of other prestigious groups, including the Association of American Colleges (AAC), and the editorial approval of the New York Times. Members of the CPD testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Preparedness, and Conant, himself, appeared before the House Armed Services Committee to attempt to win congressional support for their defense proposals.

Presidential approval of the Selective Service student deferment program prompted the CPD to sponsor a series of radio broadcasts in an attempt to gain support for UMS. In one particular broadcast, Conant and Edward R. Murrow, who also was a CPD member, appeared on a CBS broadcast to discuss the executive order. Conant viewed it as "undemocratic" and believed it would "establish a privileged class." Murrow asked Conant if it was fair to say that the President's order "stinks." "Well," Conant replied, "I shouldn't disclaim that word."[31] When the specifics of the deferment program were announced,

---

[30]Conant, My Several Lives, pp. 521-524; Marden, "Cold War and American Education," II, p. 322. For a rebuttal to the Conant Plan, see Charles Woolsey Cole, "A Reply to Harvard's Dr. Conant: A Total Conscription Will Hurt America," Look, 15 (January 2, 1951), pp. 54-55.

[31]Conant, My Several Lives, p.527; the formation and activities of the Committee on the Present Danger is described in Ibid, pp. 505-519.

including the use of test scores and class rank, Murrow continued the attack on behalf of the CPD. According to Murrow, a plan that afforded college students the opportunity of being deferred from their military obligation, while ignoring those men whose families could not bear the expense of college, was "quite a departure from our traditions." He believed that the student deferment plan was based upon the assumption that enrollment in college was enough proof of a man's "usefulness" in maintaining the national health, safety or interest. "If this rule had been applied in earlier days, people like the Wright Brothers, Mark Twain, Phil Murray, Andrew Carnegie, Henry Ford, Thomas Edison, and Harry S. Truman, among others, wouldn't have had a chance of being deferred because none of them went to college." Murrow agreed that it was essential to "nourish the minds of the youth of the nation," and to "fertilize research in all disciplines of learning," but it was also equally important to remember that throughout our history, "the word equality has been as important as test tubes, laboratories, and research into the lower forms of animal life."[32]

Conant's attempt to gain further support for the CPD program among educators was contested by the American Council on Education (ACE) and the U. S. Office of Education. When the Trytten Report was issued, ACE President Arthur Adams, who, like Conant, was an ETS trustee, and Education Commissioner Earl McGrath embraced the Committees' recommendations on student deferment; in fact, both Adams and McGrath became actively involved in public relations for the program in the educational community.

---

[32]Edward R. Murrow, "Draft Smart Students? Mark Twain, Henry Ford, Thomas Edison, Harry S. Truman Could Not Have Been Deferred -- They Didn't Go to College," CBS radio broadcast, April 5, 1951, transcript attached to letter, Murrow to Henry Chauncey, July 13, 1951, Henry Chauncey Papers, Box 2, Folder 27.

During the planning phase of the program in the fall and winter of 1950-51, Selective Service and ETS had developed procedures to disseminate as much information about the deferment plan as possible to the general public. All press releases and announcements concerning Selective Service regulations and the effects of the testing program on student deferment policy were handled by the Information Branch of Selective Service National Headquarters while ETS supplied information on the specific nature and technical aspects of the test. ETS secured an office in the ACE building in Washington to be used as a headquarters for publicity and public relations for the SSCQT and the draft deferment program. ACE agreed to serve as liaison between college and university campuses and Selective Service and ETS and to function as a clearinghouse for information concerning the program.[33]

A few days after the announcement of Truman's order, Selective Service and ETS officials were approached by the Liberty Broadcasting Company and asked to participate in a radio panel discussion entitled, "Youth and the Draft." This nationwide broadcast series dealt with all phases of the student deferment program. Among the participants were: General Hershey, Director, and Brigadier General Louis Renfrow, Associate Director, of Selective Service; Henry Chauncey, President, and William W. Turnbull, Vice-President, of ETS; Arthur S. Adams, President, and Francis J. Brown, Staff Associate, of ACE; James C. O'Brien, Assistant Commissioner of Education, U. S. Office of

---

[33]Memorandum, Jack K. Rimalover to Henry Chauncey, September 18, 1951, SSCQT Papers, Box 2, Folder 9.

Education; and M. H. Trytten. Other prominent government officials and educators appeared in later broadcasts. "Youth and the Draft" also received extensive press coverage.[34] The combined efforts of Selective Service, ETS, the American Council on Education, and the Office of Education were probably effective in gaining public support for the deferment program and the SSCQT.[35]

Passage of the Universal Military Training and Service Act

On June 19, 1951, President Truman signed into law the Universal Military Training and Service Act (Public Law 51), signifying executive and congressional approval of the use of tests as a basis for student deferment. The bill Truman signed had been prepared by the Senate-House Conference Committee which had endorsed the essential features of General Hershey's plan extending the provisions of the Selective Service Act of 1948 to July 1, 1955. Hershey's plan had been modified by members of the House Armed Services Committee who expressed concern about the possibility of deferments becoming exemptions. The House Committee added to its bill a proviso which extended the eligibility of all deferred men

---

[34]See for example, New York Times, April 9, 16, 23, and May 13, 1951; Washington Post, April 9, 1951; San Francisco Chronicle, April 16 and 23, 1951; Christian Science Monitor, April 17, 1951; Boston Globe, April 15, 1951; Denver News, April 9, 1951; and Minneapolis Tribune, April 19, 1951. An extensive file of newspaper clippings relating to the SSCQT is available in the ETS Archives.

[35]On May 26, 1951, the American Institute of Public Opinion reported that 55 percent of the public favored the deferment of college students who passed a test of general ability; see [George Gallup], "College Draft Deferment Based on General Ability Tests Gets Public's Okay," (May 26, 1951), copy of press release in SSCQT Papers, Box 2, Folder 9.

to age 35.[36] The Conference Committee accepted this extension of liability as well as an amendment to the House bill introduced by Representative Paul J. Kilday (D-Texas) that assured local draft boards and appeal boards that they would make the final decisions on occupational and student deferments.[37] The Conference Committee did reject the Senate proposals originally suggested by the Defense Department for a special program for 75,000 students and federal scholarships.[38] With Truman's signature, the debate over universal military training versus Selective Service subsided and attention focused on the effects of the law on individual citizens, the armed forces, and higher education.

---

[36]U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Armed Services, 1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act, H. Rept. No. 271, Report To Accompany S.1, 82nd Cong., 1st sess., 1951, pp. 9-13, 20-24.

[37]Congressional Record, XCVII, p. 3679.

[38]U.S. Congress, House, Universal Military Training and Service Act, H. Rept. No. 535, Conference Report To Accompany S.1, 82nd Cong., 1st sess., 1951, pp. 11, 18-23.

IV. THE SELECTIVE SERVICE COLLEGE QUALIFICATION TEST (SSCQT)

While Congress was deliberating over manpower legislation, ETS was administering, scoring, and reporting results of the SSCQT. One of the more technical problems that ETS encountered was scaling and equating the test. This was important because eligibility for deferment could not be affected by which form of the test a candidate took.

Scaling and Equating the Test

The Selective Service System specified that scores on the SSCQT were to be reported on a scale ranging from 0 to 99, "with the only raw score convertible to a score of zero being a raw score of zero, and the only raw score convertible to a score of 99 being the maximum raw score on the test." It further emphasized that the reported scale score of 70 be such that the percentage of college students who received scores of 70 or better would equal the percentage of college students who would receive Army Standard Scores of 120 or better on the Army General Classification Test (AGCT). Similarily, a reported score of 75 on the SSCQT was to be such that the percentage of students who received scores of 75 or better would equal the percentage of college students who would receive Army Standard Scores of 130 or better on the AGCT.[39] The decision by Selective Service to have SSCQT scores on a scale comparable to the AGCT was based on data accumulated during World War II. On an arbitrary AGCT scale ranging from 40 to 160, the average score for male adults during World War II was 100; slightly more than two-thirds of the army personnel achieved scores

---

[39]Educational Testing Service, A Summary of Statistics on Selective Service College Qualification Test of May 26, 1951, June 16, 1951, June 30, 1951, July 12, 1951. Statistical Report 52-1 (Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1952), p. 4.

falling between 80 and 120. Only 16 percent, or one out of six men, scored above this point but, significantly, four out of five college graduates exceeded this score. In an oral report of the Six Scientific Advisory Committees delivered before officials of the Selective Service System on December 18, 1950, E. Lowell Kelly emphasized this salient point:

> It is true that a man with a score of 135 or above can become a good soldier. It is also true that he owes as much to his country as the lad with a score of 80 or 110. But can we as a nation, faced with the necessity of developing and maintaining our technological and military supremacy, afford to utilize these two men in the same manner? . . . these facts concerning differences in human ability must be allowed for if we are not to squander one of our most precious national resources.[40]

Because the SSCQT was to be administered on four separate dates, Selective Service requested that ETS develop four different forms of the test, one for each administration date. For security reasons, there were to be no common items from form to form; however, each form was to be designed so that it was equivalent in difficulty and item content to the other forms. In order to place all four forms of the SSCQT on the same score scale and also to maintain the relationships to the AGCT score scale specified by Selective Service, ETS contructed a special control form of the test in the spring of 1951. This form, Form ZVN, contained items drawn equally from the first four operational forms of the SSCQT:

TABLE 1

SSCQT EXPERIMENTAL FORM ZVN

Analogies	15 items
Arithmetic Reasoning	45 items
Reading Comprehension	45 items
Data Interpretation	30 items
Sentence Completion	15 items
	150 items

[40] E. Lowell Kelly, "The Facts" (oral report of the Six Scientific Advisory Committees delivered to the Director of Selective Service System, December 18, 1950), included in Trytten, Student Deferment and Selective Service, p. 101.

In order to equate the SSCQT to the AGCT, ETS found it necessary to administer ZVN and a form of the AGCT to a population that would be ineligible for the draft. It therefore secured the cooperation of three groups of examinees "widely divergent in expected test performance": U.S. Military Academy cadets, U.S. Merchant Marine Academy cadets, and Air Force enlisted men at Lackland Air Force Base in San Antonio, Texas. The Personnel Research Section of the Adjutant General's Office, Department of the Army, supplied Form 1c of the AGCT.

During the week of May 21, 1951, Forms ZVN and AGCT 1c were administered to virtually all men routinely processed at Lackland Air Force Base. On May 26, the date of the first nationwide SSCQT administration, the two tests were given to random halves of groups of examinees at West Point and the Merchant Marine Academy. A total of 2250 examinees participated in the experimental testing program. Form ZVN was equated to the AGCT and placed on the desired 0-99 score scale. There was a marked difference in performance on ZVN between the Air Force group and the cadets. Since the scholastic ability of the academy groups was closer to that of college students than to that of Air Force personnel, the lines of comparability for SSCQT and AGCT scores were drawn to fit the data of the cadet group. The results of the experimental testing yielded the comparability of scores between the SSCQT and the AGCT shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2

COMPARABLE SSCQT SCORES AND AGCT SCORES
(comparable scores applicable for college men only)

SSCQT Score	Army Standard Score
80 and above	144 and above
79	141-143
78	138-140
77	135-137
76	132-134
75	130-131
74	128-129
73	126-127
72	124-125
71	122-123
70	120-121
69 and below	119 and below

Source: Educational Testing Service. A Summary of Statistics on Selective Service College Qualification Test of May 26, 1951, June 16, 1951, June 30, 1951, July 12, 1951. Statistical Report 52-1 (Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1952), Table 12, p. 30.

Immediately following the first operational administration of the SSCQT, a conversion sample was drawn and statistics collected by ETS statistical analysis staff to equate scores on Form ZSS2, the form used for the May 26th nationwide administration, to the ZVN raw score scale. ETS followed this procedure for equating all subsequent forms of the test from 1951 to 1953. Thus, ZVN, the experimental or control form of the deferment test, made it possible to insure that scores on each operational form of the SSCQT could be used interchangeably.[41]

---

[41]Educational Testing Service, "Scaling of the Selective Service College Qualification Test Administered May-June-July, 1951," [August 1, 1951]; memorandum, William H. Angoff, "Selective Service College Qualification Test, April 23, 1953 and May 21, 1953: Outline of Operational Procedures for Scaling," March 3, 1953, SSCQT Papers, Box 4, Folder 28.

Test Administration and National Results: First Series, May-July, 1951

The SSCQT was administered to 339,042 candidates during the first four testing dates. This number represented about 21 percent of the total male college-student population in the United States, estimated at 1,569,000 in the fall of 1950. More than half of this latter figure consisted of students either ineligible to take the test or with no reason to do so. Included in this group were veterans, non-veterans who were pursuing part-time study or who were non-degree students, non-veterans studying full time but who were under 18 or over 26 years old, ROTC students, and those classified by Selective Service as physically or mentally unfit for military service. ETS estimated that 70-80 percent of those students both eligible and not already deferrable from military service on other grounds actually took the test. Of those students who took the SSCQT during the first series of testing, 64 percent achieved a score of 70 or better.[42] Table 3 provides a breakdown for each testing date.

TABLE 3

SSCQT: FIRST SERIES RESULTS, 1951

Date	Form	No. of Candidates	Percent Scoring 70 or Better
May 26, 1951	ZSS2	165,010	65%
June 16, 1951	ZSS3	106,829	62%
June 30, 1951	ZSS1	63,997	61%
July 12, 1951	ZSS4	3,206	58%
Totals		339,042	64%

[42]Test results for the first series of the SSCQT are included in A Summary of Statistics on Selective Service College Qualification Test of May 26, 1951, June 16, 1951, June 30, 1951, July 12, 1951, Statistical Report 52-1 (hereafter cited as Summary of Statistics on SSCQT, 1951, SR-52-1); Henry Chauncey, "The Use of the Selective Service College Qualification Test in the Deferment of College Students," Science, 116, No. 3004 (July 25, 1952), pp. 73-79; and Trytten, Student Deferment in Selective Service, pp. 67-80.

ETS conducted an extensive program of statistical analysis on the results of the SSCQT. This effort was intended to serve two main purposes: to supply the Selective Service System with quantitative information needed for immediate operation of the testing program and to assist in the future development of the testing program and of the Selective Service student deferment plan by "supplying more detailed information than was previously available concerning test performance of college students." Three particular types of statistical studies were identified as the most appropriate for yielding the necessary data: 1) internal analyses of the test: its difficulty, reliability, consistency, and speededness, 2) descriptive statistics of the numbers tested and of the test performance of various subgroups of the population tested, according to geographical region, major field of study, and college year of study, and 3) the relation of college grades to the SSCQT scores and to other educational aptitude test scores.

By studying test characteristics of the SSCQT on the basis of the first series results, ETS statistical personnel concluded that the scores were stable, and they estimated that "99 out of 100 candidates, if retested, would probably achieve scores differing no more than five points from their original scores." The high proportion of students completing the examination (57 percent answering all questions, 79 percent leaving no more than four questions unanswered, and 92 percent answering at least one of the last five questions) indicated that the test was primarily a "power" test and the time allotted to complete the examination (3 hours) was sufficient.

The percent of candidates scoring 70 or higher on the SSCQT differed significantly from one geographical region to another and from one major field of study to another. The range for students achieving 70 or above ran from

73 percent in the New England states to 42 percent in the East South Central states. Estimates based on a 10 percent sample of candidates according to major field of study indicated that engineering, physical science and mathematics had the highest percentage of students equalling or exceeding the critical scores of 70 and 75. Social science majors were also consistently above average while education was the lowest-ranking field.[43]

To conduct its validity studies of the SSCQT, ETS selected 23 colleges and universities representing a reasonable coverage of geographical divisions, types of colleges and universities, and various academic divisions. The combination of data obtained from these institutions with score tabulations from a 10 percent sample of all candidates tested enabled ETS to estimate that 68 percent of all freshmen, 81 percent of all sophomores, and 88 percent of all juniors who took the SSCQT were eligible for deferment under the Selective Service provisions for class standing and test scores (see Table 4). Data from the 23-college sample was also used to compare the correlation between grades and scores on the SSCQT with that of two widely-used tests of educational aptitude -- the College Board Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) and the American Council on Education Psychological Examination -- both of which were effective in predicting college

---

[43]The category "education" included all male students who reported education as their present or intended major field of study, including elementary education, commercial education physical and health education. It did not include subject-matter specialists preparing for high school or college teaching; these students designated themselves as majoring in a particular subject area. The education group, therefore, was not a representative sample of future teachers. Based on the low performance of the education group on the test, ETS concluded that "a large number of low-ability students [were] preparing to enter the teaching field." See Summary of Statistics on SSCQT, 1951, SR-52-1, pp. 13-14; Educational Testing Service, Annual Report to the Board of Trustees, 1951-1952 (Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1952), pp. 14-15.

success. The comparison showed that the SSCQT had a very satisfactory correlation with college performance.[44]

TABLE 4

STUDENT DEFERMENT ELIGIBILITY, FALL 1951
(By Percentage)

College Year	Reason for Deferability			
	Test Score Only*	Test Score and Class Standing**	Class Standing Only***	Total
Freshman	18	35	15	68
Sophomore	14	48	19	81
Junior	13	58	17	88

SOURCE: Educational Testing Service. A Summary of Statistics on Selective Service College Qualification Test of May 26, 1951, June 16, 1951, June 30, 1951, July 12, 1951. Statistical Report 52-1 (Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1952), Table 9, p. 23.

* Percent scoring 70 or higher but standing in lower portion of class.
** Percent scoring 70 or higher and standing in upper portion of class.
*** Percent scoring below 70 but standing in upper portion of class.

SSCQT, 1951-1954

The student deferment program proved to be effective in maintaining an adequate number of students in colleges and universities and Selective Service

[44] Summary of Statistics on SSCQT, 1951, SR-52-1, pp. 60-62.

determined to continue the SSCQT. Selective Service and ETS had handled their first contract on a negotiated basis. Unlike the more frequently used cost-plus type of contract, ETS performed SSCQT work for a fixed price, plus a per candidate fee, an arrangement of greater risk to ETS if unforeseen problems arose. As it happened, the program ran unexpectedly smoothly and ETS did very well financially.[45] For the 1951-1952 SSCQT program, Selective Service decided to issue program specifications and invite competitive bidding on the contract. ETS and Richardson, Bellows, and Henry submitted bids; the contract was awarded on August 27, 1951 to ETS, which, on the basis of first-year experience, had lowered its bid.

Three new forms were developed by ETS test development staff for the 1951-52 program and the test was administered on December 13, 1951 and April 24, and May 22, 1952. Form ZSS5, administered on December 13, contained the same item types used in the first four forms of the SSCQT: Verbal Relations, Arithmetic Reasoning, Reading Comprehension, and Data Interpretation.[46] In April, however, "quantitative reasoning" items were introduced; these items required a candidate to demonstrate a combination of data interpretation and reading comprehension skills. Though it still consisted of 150 questions, the SSCQT now included six item types.

A total of 74,327 candidates took the examination in 1951-52, with 58 percent achieving a score of 70 or higher. The results of the program were quite similar to those of the first SSCQT series in 1951. The only substantial

---

[45]Henry Chauncey, Oral History Interview, VI, November 8, 1977, ETS Archives Oral History Program, p. 11. For a discussion of the merits of fixed price versus cost-plus see memorandum, Robert F. Kolkebeck to Henry Chauncey, September 25, 1950, SSCQT Papers, Box 1, Folder 4.

[46]Verbal relations items included antonyms or verbal analogies along with either sentence completion or double definition items.

difference lay in the lower number of candidates tested (see Table 5). Since members of the sophomore, junior, and senior classes had had the opportunity to take the test during the previous spring and summer, freshmen constituted a much larger proportion of the total group tested than was the case in the first series.

TABLE 5

SSCQT: SECOND SERIES RESULTS, 1951-1952

Date	Form	No. of Candidates	Percent scoring 70 or better
December 13, 1951	ZSS5	19,574	61%
April 24, 1952	ZSS6	48,809	57%
May 22, 1952	ZSS7	5,942	57%
Totals		74,327	58%

Once again there was a marked difference in the percentage of candidates equalling or exceeding the critical scores of 70 and 75 when comparing geographical regions and major fields of study. Students residing in the New England, Middle Atlantic, and Pacific states performed much better on the SSCQT than students of the East South Central and West South Central regions. The percentage of candidates equalling or exceeding the critical scores was higher for those candidates indicating engineering, physical sciences and mathematics as their major area of concentration than for those studying education, and business and commerce.[47]

In the fall of 1952, General Hershey, noting the number of students enrolling in graduate and professional schools, asked for a "strict tightening up" of

---

[47]Educational Testing Service, A Summary of Statistics on Selective Service College Qualification Test of December 13, 1951, April 24, 1952, May 22, 1952, Statistical Report 53-1 (Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1953), passim.

requirements for graduate deferment. This led to discussions between Selective Service officials and ETS staff on the impact of changed cutting scores for the SSCQT. The manpower available to the armed forces was also being affected by an increase in ROTC programs. Selective Service officials felt that "inferior" students were escaping the draft "via ROTC."[48] Hershey requested the Selective Service Advisory Committees on Specialized Personnel to review the student deferment policy and offer suggestions to alleviate the problems of graduate deferment and ROTC.

Responding to this request, M. H. Trytten, General Chairman of the Committees, recommended several changes in student deferment requirements to General Hershey in February 1953. He proposed increasing the cutting score to 80 and class standing to the upper one-fourth for seniors proceeding to graduate school, 75 or upper three-fourths for juniors, 75 or upper two-thirds for sophomores, and 70 or upper one-third for freshmen. He also suggested that all ROTC students be required to meet II-S standards for deferment. The final proposal offered by the Committee, and the only one that received serious consideration, was to permit high school students to take the SSCQT, qualifying for deferment when they were accepted by college and had achieved a score of 70 or above on the test. ETS estimated that an additional 140,000 to 175,000 high school seniors would take the SSCQT in the spring of 1954 if this proposal were adopted by Selective Service, but a sudden increase in the number of volunteers into the

---

[48]Jack K. Rimalover, "Memorandum of Conference with General Hershey at Selective Service Headquarters, Washington, D.C., September 2, 1952," September 10, 1952; John T. Cowles, Memorandum for the Record, "Conference at Selective Service Headquarters, November 6, 1952," November 24, 1952; memorandum, Jack K. Rimalover to Henry Chauncey, "Visit to Selective Service Headquarters, December 12, 1952," December 16, 1952; SSCQT Papers, Box 2, Folder 10.

armed forces eliminated the necessity for high school testing.[49]

Selective Service awarded ETS the SSCQT contracts for the 1952-53 and 1953-54 programs; in fact, there were no other bidders. The results of the testing for these years were fairly consistent with those of the two previous series in 1951 and 1952. The only substantial difference was the decreasing number of candidates taking the SSCQT due to the winding down of hostilities in Korea and the subsequent reduction in numbers of men being drafted into the service (see Tables 6 and 7).[50]

TABLE 6

SSCQT: THIRD SERIES RESULTS, 1952-1953

Date	Form	No. of Candidates	Percent Scoring 70 or Better
December 4, 1952	ZSS8	17,939	63%
April 23, 1953	ZSS9	41,164	55%
May 21, 1953	ZSS10	9,931	52%
Totals		69,034	57%

TABLE 7

SSCQT: FOURTH SERIES RESULTS, 1953-1954

Date	Form	No. of Candidates	Percent Scoring 70 or Better
November 19, 1953	ZSS11	20,175	64%
April 22, 1954	ZSS12	30,279	70%
May 20, 1954	ZSS13	4,267	61%
Totals		54,721	67%

[49]Letter, M. H. Trytten to Major General Lewis B. Hershey, February 25, 1953, included as Appendix to Minutes of February 19-20, 1953 Meeting of Scientific Advisory Committees; memorandum, William B. Schrader to Robert V. Bartnik, November 16, 1953; memorandum, Jack K. Rimalover to Robert V. Bartnik, et. al., February 9, 1954, SSCQT Papers, Box 2 Folder 11.

[50]Educational Testing Service, "Extract of Descriptive Statistics on Selective Service College Qualification Test, December 4, 1952, April 23, 1953, May 21, 1953, November 19, 1953, and May 20, 1954" (April 1953-August 1954), SSCQT Papers, Box 4, Folder 25.

Science Research Associates (SRA), ETS, and Richardson, Bellows and Henry submitted bids on the 1954-55 contract and Selective Service awarded the contract to SRA, whose bid was the lowest. Reflecting on the loss of the contract, Chauncey suggested ". . . they just sharpened their pencils a little sharper than we had and they got the program."[51] SRA kept their pencils sharpened and succeeded in outbidding ETS for the SSCQT contract from 1954 to 1958.

Science Research Associates and the SSCQT, 1954-1958

The size of the Selective Service student deferment program continued to decrease as the Korean War came to an end and the number of men being called into military service was reduced. One interesting development in the results of the SSCQT was the concomitant increase in quality of test performance and decrease in numbers of candidates.

SRA conducted its first series of testing on December 9, 1954, and April 21 and May 19, 1955. SSCQT candidates numbered 27,654, with 87 percent scoring 70 or above. During the 1955-56 program, administered in November, 1955, and April and May, 1956, 17,003 candidates were tested, of whom 84 percent achieved 70 or higher. And in November, 1956, and April and May, 1957, 11,122 students were administered the SSCQT with 85 percent reaching or exceeding the score of 70. Reasons for the increase in quality of test performance, based on reports from participating colleges and universities, were offered by SRA in its 1954-55 summary report to the Selective Service System:

---

[51]Henry Chauncey, Oral History Interview, VI, November 8, 1977, ETS Archives Oral History Program, p. 12; see also letter, Lt. Colonel T. E. Roberts to Educational Testing Service, August 10, 1954; memorandum, Richard Sullivan to Henry Chauncey, August 19, 1954; memorandum, Robert V. Bartnik to Sullivan, August 25, 1954, September 2, 1954, SSCQT Papers, Box 2, Folder 11;

> . . . [poor] students indicated that they preferred to avoid the "tough" SSCQT. Further, rightly or wrongly, they felt that their chances of draft deferment were better if they did not take the test at all, as against taking the test and having a below-70 score reported to their local draft boards.
> . . . these students [also] indicated that, if they eventually had to take the test, they preferred to take the test late in their college careers -- in order to take advantage of the learning experiences in additional college courses.
> In contrast to such reports on inferior students, superior students were quoted as indicating that "I'd like to get the test behind me and forget about the possibility of being drafted now.[52]

Candidate volume for the 1958 SSCQT was sufficiently low to accommodate all students in one nationwide administration. On May 1, SRA administered the SSCQT to 5,403 examinees of which 79 percent scored 70 or above.[53] This trend of low candidate volume and high performance on the deferment test continued for the next five years.

ETS and the SSCQT, 1959-1962

ETS regained the Selective Service program contract in 1958 and conducted SSCQT administrations from 1959 to 1962. The program switched back to SRA in 1963 and then Selective Service suspended the program because of diminishing candidate volume.

Compared to the initial SSCQT in 1951, or other testing programs conducted by ETS, the SSCQT in this period was a relatively small program. Test administrations continued on a nationwide basis once a year, with the volume of examinees never exceeding 6,000 (see Table 8).[54]

---

[52]Robert Bauernfeind and John Paisios, Summary Report for the Selective Service System College Qualification Tests, Academic Year 1954-1955 (Chicago: Science Research Associates, [1955]), pp. 15-16.

[53]Results of the SRA testing, 1955-1958, are in letter, Robert Perloff to Colonel Dee Ingold, July 31, 1958, copy in SSCQT Papers, Box 4, Folder 24.

[54]William B. Schrader, "Statistical Reports for SSCQT Administrations, 1959-1962," SSCQT Papers, Box 4, Folder 25.

TABLE 8

SSCQT RESULTS, 1959-1962

Date	Form	No. of Candidates	Percent Scoring 70 or Better
April 30, 1959	ZSS14	5,258	82%
April 28, 1960	ZSS15I	3,316	85%
April 27, 1961	ZSS16J	3,520	78%
April 17, 1962	ZSS17K	4,648	83%

SSCQT Reinstated, 1966-1967

Following suspension of the SSCQT in 1963, students continued to be deferred from military service on the basis of three factors: full-time student status, "satisfactory progress" in their studies, and relative class standing among other registrants in school. Because of the low draft quotas set by Selective Service and sufficient volunteer enlistments in the armed services, college students were able to continue their studies without interruption until the United States escalated its involvement in the Vietnam War. In August 1965, President Lyndon Johnson called for a substantial increase in military manpower. Selective Service began to raise monthly quotas and it became evident that the supply of eligible men would be quickly exhausted. In March 1966, with an expected monthly quota of 30,000 men to be called into military service, General Hershey announced the resumption of the SSCQT as a criterion in determining student deferments.[55]

Selective Service National Headquarters provided the general guidelines, but the decision on individual student deferment continued to rest with the local draft boards. Revised class-standing requirements were issued as upper

---

[55]An estimated 3 million men were enrolled in American colleges and universities during the 1965-1966 academic year.

one-half for students ending their freshman year, upper two-thirds for sophomores, upper three-quarters for juniors, and upper one-fourth for seniors planning to enter graduate school. The cutting score for the SSCQT continued at 70 for undergraduate students but was raised to 80 for graduate students. The test was not mandatory, but all male high school seniors and college students were urged to take the examination. This was clearly reflected in the candidate volume for the SSCQT program in 1966.

Science Research Associates, in competitive bidding against ETS, received the SSCQT contract for the spring of 1966. The test was admininstered to 767,935 candidates on four separate dates: May 14, May 21, June 3, and June 24. An analysis of the scores achieved by the examinees indicated that 81 percent scored 70 or better.[56]

SRA and ETS participated in the bidding for the 1966-1967 SSCQT program. Both bids were initially rejected - SRA's because it was "unreasonable as to price," and ETS's because it proposed a candidate fee based on "applicants registered" rather than "registrants tested." SRA declined to change its price, but ETS agreed to alter its bid if it was compensated for those candidates who registered but did not take the examination. General Hershey accepted this alternative and awarded the SSCQT contract to ETS in August, 1966. [57]

---

[56] Selective Service press release, September 23, 1966, copy in SSCQT Papers, Box 2, Folder 14.

[57] Memorandum, Robert J. Solomon to Joseph L. Boyd, et. al., August 12, 1966; Memoranda for the Record, Robert J. Solomon, August 16, August 17, 1966; letter, Lewis B. Hershey to Educational Testing Service, August 19, 1966, SSCQT Papers, Box 2, Folder 14.

Scaling the SSCQT, 1966

During the early administrations of the SSCQT, the percentage of examinees who achieved scores of 70 or better averaged approximately 62. But in the spring of 1966, this percentage rose to 81. This magnitude of difference provoked considerable speculation among educators and the general public. Were the high school and college students of 1966 more able scholastically than the students of the 1950s and early 1960s? Had the population of students taking the SSCQT changed drastically? Or was the difference in percentages the result of a difference in the score scale? This latter hypothesis was of particular concern to ETS. As part of the agreement with Selective Service to conduct the fall and spring 1966-1967 series of testing, ETS was required to construct forms of the test scaled so that a score of 70 was comparable to 120 on the AGCT and "otherwise scaled in terms of the AGCT to be equivalent to the Spring 1966 score scale." Were the methods of scaling used by ETS and SRA comparable? Was there a possibility that the cutting score of 70 reported by ETS did not have the same meaning as a 70 reported by SRA?[58]

The results of an equating study conducted by ETS in the fall of 1966 were inconclusive as to how closely the SRA score scale agreed with the ETS scale. But the study did indicate that the two scales were sufficiently different that ETS employed direct equating of its form of the SSCQT to the SRA form in order to increase the equivalence of scores reported in the spring and fall of 1966.[59]

---

[58]Letter, Robert J. Solomon to Lt. Colonel N. A. Hawkinson, October 24, 1966, SSCQT Papers, Box 3, Folder 15.

[59]Gary Marco, "Establishing the Score Scale for Forms OSS1 and OSS2 of the SSCQT" (December 1966), SSCQT Papers, Box 3, Folder 15.

SSCQT Results, 1966-1967

On November 18 and 19, 1966, ETS administered the SSCQT to 109,813 candidates. The percentage of examinees who scored 70 or above was 81, the same percentage as reported for the SRA administrations in the Spring of 1966 (see Table 9).

TABLE 9

SSCQT RESULTS, Fall 1966

Date	Form	No. of Candidates	Percent Scoring 70 or Better
November 18, 1966	OSS1	13,294	82%
November 19, 1966	OSS2	96,519	80%
Totals		109,813	81%

Once again, candidates from New England and the Middle Atlantic states scored higher than examinees from the other geographical regions, although the percentage of candidates from the East South Central states who achieved or exceeded the critical score did increase from 53 percent in the spring to 72 percent in November.

College freshman were the largest student group taking the SSCQT in November, constituting 48 percent of the total number of candidates, as compared to 42 percent of the group tested by SRA in the spring. The percentages of candidates in other student groups were similar to those reported for the groups tested in the spring, with the exception of high school seniors. Of the total number of candidates who were administered the SSCQT in the spring, 5.3 percent were high school seniors, but only 0.6 percent of the fall students were in this group. The performance of the various student groups was consistent with

educational level; the higher the education level, the higher the mean and median score.[60]

The last three administrations of the SSCQT occurred in the Spring of 1967. On March 3, March 31, and April 8, a total of 57,133 candidates took the draft deferment test, with 81 percent scoring 70 or above (see Table 10). As before, candidates from the New England and Middle Atlantic states scored higher than examinees from the other regions of the country. The proportion of candidates who scored 70 or above according to geographical region was relatively consistent with the November administrations.

TABLE 10

SSCQT RESULTS, SPRING 1967

Date	Form	No. of Candidates	Percent Scoring 70 or Better
March 3, 1967	PSS1	34,878	80%
March 31, 1967	PSS2	3,040	83%
April 8, 1967	PSS3	19,215	84%
Totals		57,133	81%

Once again, college freshmen were the largest student group taking the SSCQT. Compared to the November, 1966 administrations, there was a greater proportion of high school seniors and college freshmen and a lesser proportion of college sophomores and juniors. The percentages of college seniors and graduates remained approximately the same. Candidates who indicated physical

[60]Educational Testing Service, Summary of the Performance of Candidates Who Took the Selective Service College Qualification Test in the Fall of 1966. Statistical Report 67-13 (Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, March, 1967).

science and mathematics as their major field of study were among the highest scoring on the SSCQT in the spring. Agriculture and education majors were among the lowest-scoring.[61]

---

[61]Educational Testing Service, Summary of the Performance of Candidates Who Took the Selective Service College Qualification Test in the Spring of 1967. Statistical Report 67-57 (Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, July, 1967).

V. STUDENT DEFERMENT AND SELECTIVE SERVICE, 1967-1973

The Vietnam War and the related anti-war and anti-draft movements renewed public debate over military manpower policy in the mid-1960s. President Johnson responded on July 2, 1966 when he appointed a 20-man National Advisory Commission to conduct a study of the Selective Service System. Burke Marshall, Vice President of IBM and former Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights in the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations, served as chairman. Concurrently, House Armed Services Committee Chairman L. Mendel Rivers (D-SC) formed the Civilian Advisory Panel on Military Manpower Procurement and named General Mark Clark, President Emeritus of the Citadel, as its leader. Both the Marshall Commission and the Clark Panel reported their recommendations in February, 1967; both proposals pleased supporters of Selective Service.

The Clark Panel called for the continuation of the Selective Service System and urged Congress to change the name of manpower legislation to the "Selective Service Act" to emphasize its military aspects. In reviewing student deferment policy, the Panel felt that deferring full-time college students had been a "wise and necessary procedure" because national security required a constant supply of educated citizens for civilian and military needs. It specifically proposed that all qualified individuals be granted deferments to attend postsecondary educational institutions. Those deferments would be terminated when the individuals reached the age of 24. The Panel favored implementing a "modified age system" for conscription, whereby 19- and 20-year old males would be selected first, as opposed to the "oldest-first" principle, which Selective Service had followed in the past. Students whose deferments had been terminated would be returned to the 19-20-year old group

for selection and possible induction. Deferments would be extended beyond age 24 only for those full-time students in medical, dental, veterinary, or related health fields and "critically-needed occupations and professions designated by the National Security Council." In summary, the Clark panel believed that these deferment procedures would eliminate the practice of requiring educational institutions to report each student's relative class standing and further eliminate the necessity of administering the SSCQT, which the Panel judged as having "questionable value."[62]

The Marshall Commission agreed with the Clark Panel recommendation to continue Selective Service, but it favored consolidating and centralizing the system. It concurred with the proposal for introducing the "modified age system," but differed with the Panel in that it opposed granting further student or occupational deferments. According to its plan, only students in school and men in "recognized apprentice training" would be permitted to complete their degrees and programs when new legislation went into effect. Upon termination of their deferments, these men would be entered along with the 18-year old group for random selection into military service. After the plan was adopted, men who were already in college when they were selected for service would be allowed to complete their sophomore year of instruction before induction.[63]

---

[62]Civilian Advisory Panel on Military Manpower Procurement, Report to the Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, 90th Cong., 1st sess., February 28, 1967 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967), pp. 10-12, 21-23. The Report is also included as an appendix in Harry A. Marmion, Selective Service: Conflict and Compromise (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1968), I-1.

[63]In Pursuit of Equity: Who Serves When Not All Serve? Report of the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service, February, 1967 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967). A summary of the Report appears as Appendix II in Marmion, Selective Service, pp. II,1-9.

In June 1967, Congress followed closely the Clark Panel recommendations on student deferment when it passed the Military Selective Service Act. As in past legislation, Congress authorized the President to determine the rules and regulations for deferment of persons "satisfactorily pursuing full-time instruction at a college, university, or similar institution of learning and who request such deferment." He also had the authority to restrict or terminate student deferments to meet the manpower needs of the armed forces.[64] President Johnson issued an executive order implementing blanket deferment for undergraduate students and continued deferment of graduate students in medical and related health fields and of other students beginning their second or later year of graduate study before the fall of 1967. He further authorized one-year-only deferments for first-year graduate students, a decision which was reversed early in 1968 when the National Security Council asserted that graduate deferments in fields outside of medicine and health were no longer considered essential to the national interest.[65] Selective Service immediately notified its local boards. As a result, graduate school enrollment declined slightly while the proportion of college graduates among new draftees increased substantially after mid-1968.[66] This reinforced opposition to Selective Service and renewed the call for its reform.

---

[64]U.S. Congress, Senate. An Act to Amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, Public Law 90-40, S. 1432, 90th Cong., 1st sess., 1967.

[65]U.S. President, Executive Order, "Amending the Selective Service Regulations," Federal Register, XXXII, June 30, 1967, p. 9787; Gerhardt, The Draft and Public Policy, p. 343.

[66]See Scientific Manpower Commission and the Council of Graduate Schools of the United States, The Impact of the Draft on Graduate Schools in 1968-69 (Washington, D.C.: Scientific Manpower Commission, March 1968), p. 1.

Throughout 1966 and 1967, Richard Nixon had been calling for the introduction of a lottery system for military conscription. After he became President, he proposed the plan to Congress in the spring of 1969, and appointed a commission chaired by Thomas Gates, former Secretary of Defense, to study the feasibility of an all-volunteer army. Congress voted in favor of the lottery in the fall and the first drawing took place in December of 1969. In February 1970, the Gates Commission reported favorably on the proposal for introducing an all-volunteer armed force.[67] President Nixon named Curtis Tarr to replace General Hershey as the System's Director in March 1970. The following month he requested that Congress eliminate the provision making undergraduate deferment mandatory. On December 10, 1971, student deferments were terminated by the President. Two years later, an all-volunteer armed force replaced the Selective Service System and suspended the persistent debate over military conscription and student deferment policy until 1980, when President Jimmy Carter's proposal to reinstate draft registration again made Selective Service a political issue.

---

[67]U.S. President's Commission on a All-Volunteer Force, Report (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970); see also Lawrence M. Baskir and William A. Strauss, Chance and Circumstance: The Draft, the War and the Vietnam Generation (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1978), pp. 26-29, 237.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Manuscript Collections

Administrative Committee Files, ETS Archives.

Henry Chauncey Papers, GA/C3, ETS Archives.

Selective Service College Qualification Test (SSCQT) Papers, TP/2A12, ETS Archives.

Tests and Measurements Committee Files, ETS Archives.

Government Publications

Congressional Record, XCVII.

In Pursuit of Equity: Who Serves When Not All Serve? Report of the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service, February, 1967. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

A Program for National Security: Report of the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1947.

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Armed Services. Civilian Advisory Panel on Military Manpower Procurement. Report to the Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, 90th Cong., 1st sess., February 28, 1967. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Armed Services. 1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act. H. Rept. 271 To Accompany S.1, 82d Cong., 1st sess., 1951.

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Armed Services. Universal Military Training. Hearings and Papers, 4, 82d Cong., 1st sess., 1951.

U.S. Congress. House. The Selective Service Act of 1948. Pub. L. 80-759, 80th Cong., 1st sess., H.R. 6401,1948.

U.S. Congress. House. Universal Military Training and Service Act. H. Rept. 535, Conference Report To Accompany S.1, 82d Cong., 1st sess., 1951.

U.S. Congress. Senate. An Act to Amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act. Pub. L. 90-40, S.1432, 90th Cong., 1st sess., 1967.

U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Armed Services. Universal Military Training and Service Act of 1951. Hearings Before the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, 82d Cong., 1st sess., 1951.

U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Armed Services. Universal Military Training and Service Act. S. Rept. 117 To Accompany S.1, 82d Cong., 1st sess., 1951.

U.S. President. Executive Order. "Amending the Selective Service Regulations." Federal Register, XVI, March 31, 1951.

U.S. President. Executive Order. "Amending the Selective Service Regulations." Federal Register, XXXII, June 30, 1967.

U.S. President. Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States. Washington, D.C.: Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Service, 1953-. Harry S. Truman, 1948-1951.

U.S. President's Commission on an All-Volunteer Force. Report. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970.

Articles, Books and Reports

Baskir, Lawrence M. and Strauss, William A. Chance and Circumstance: The Draft, the War and the Vietnam Generation. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1978.

Bauernfeind, Robert and Paisios, John. Summary Report for the Selective Service System College Qualification Tests, Academic Year 1954-1955. Chicago: Science Research Associates, [1955].

Chauncey, Henry. "The Use of the Selective Service College Qualification Test in the Deferment of College Students." Science, 116, No. 3004 (July 25, 1952), 73-79.

Conant, James B. My Several Lives: Memoirs of a Social Inventor. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.

Cowles, John T. and Olsen, Marjorie A. "The Verbal-Quantitative Balance of the 1951-1954 Selective Service College Qualification Test." School and Society, 80, No. 2047 (November 1954), 169-173.

Educational Testing Service. Annual Report to the Board of Trustees. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1950, 1951, 1952.

_____. Selective Service College Qualification Test. Bulletin of Information. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1951-1954, 1959-1962, 1966-1967.

_____. Statistical Studies of Selective Service Testing, 1951-1953. Statistical Report 55-30. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1955.

_____. Summary of Performance of Candidates Who Took the Selective Service College Qualification Test in the Fall of 1966. Statistical Report 67-13. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1967.

_____. Summary of Performance of Candidates Who Took the Selective Service College Qualification Test in the Spring of 1967. Statistical Report 67-57. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1967.

_____. A Summary of Statistics on Selective Service College Qualification Test of December 13, 1951, April 24, 1952, May 22, 1952. Statistical Report 53-01. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1953.

_____. A Summary of Statistics on Selective Service College Qualification Test of May 26, 1951, June 16, 1951, June 30, 1951, July 12, 1951. Statistical Report 52-1. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1952.

Findley, Warren G. "The Selective Service College Qualification Test." American Psychologist, 6, No. 5 (May 1951), 181-183.

French, John W. Factor Study of the Selective Service College Qualification Test. Research Bulletin 55-09. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1955.

Gerhardt, James M. The Draft and Public Policy: Issues in Military Manpower Procurement, 1945-1970. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1971.

Hershey, Major General Lewis B. "Luncheon Address." Proceedings of the 1951 Invitational Conference on Testing Problems. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1952, pp. 58-70.

Marmion, Harry A. "Historical Background of Selective Service in the United States," in Selective Service and American Society. Edited by Roger W. Little. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1969, pp. 35-52.

_____. Selective Service: Conflict and Compromise. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1968.

National Manpower Council. Student Deferment and National Manpower Policy. New York: Columbia University Press, 1952.

Schultz, Douglas G. Analysis of the SSCQT "Student Questionnaire": Plans and Progress. Research Memorandum 52-05. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1952.

_____. The Relationship Between College Grades and Aptitude Tests Scores for Different Socioeconomic Groups. Research Bulletin 53-18. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1953.

_____. Use of the Official Bulletin of Information and Published Practice Books As Preparation for the Selective Service College Qualification Test. Research Bulletin 53-15. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1953.

Science Research Associates. Selective Service College Qualification Test. Bulletin of Information. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1954-1958, 1963, 1966.

Scientific Manpower Commission and the Council of Graduate Schools of the United States. The Impact of the Draft on Graduate Schools in 1968-69. Washington, D.C.: Scientific Manpower Commission, March 1968.

Swineford, Frances. The Use of a Heterogeneous Score as Criterion for Item Biserial Correlations. Statistical Report 54-09. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1954.

Trytten, Merriam Hartwick. Student Deferment in Selective Service: A Vital Factor in National Security. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1952.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. Historical Statistics of the United States, Colonial Times to 1970. Bicentennial Edition. 2 vols. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975.

U.S. Selective Service System. Outline of Historical Background of Selective Service and Chronology. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1952.

Unpublished Material

Chauncey, Henry. "ETS and the National Government." Printed Memorandum, January 22, 1951.

_____. "Fairness of Mental Tests." Printed Memorandum, January 23, 1951.

_____. "How Useful Are Tests in Selection?" Address to Breakfast Conference, Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C., April 27, 1951.

_____. "'Joe College' or 'G.I. Joe'?" Speech delivered at the Cooperative Forum, Washington, D.C., May 23, 1951.

_____. Oral History Interview, VI, November 8, 1977. ETS Archives Oral History Program.

_____. "Tests for Draft Deferment." Speech presented before the Commonwealth Club of California, San Francisco, California, June 15, 1951.

_____. "The Use of the Selective Service College Qualification Test in the Deferment of College Students." Presented before the Conference on Scientific Manpower, American Association for the Advancement of Science, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, December 30, 1951.

Cowles, John T. "The Selective Service College Qualification Test Program: Development and Studies of Outcomes." Paper presented on the Inception and Administration of the Testing Program, American Psychological Association Symposium on the SSCQT, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, September 3, 1952.

Diederich, Paul B. "Are College Aptitude Tests Fair to Low Income Groups?" Typescript, April 11, 1951.

_____. "The College Draft Deferment Program." Typescript, April 20, 1951.

_____ and Turnbull, William W. "Who Will Do Well in College?" Mimeograph, March 5, 1951.

Graham, John. "Military Conscription in the United States -- Proposals, Issues, Legislation: An Historical Survey." Paper presented to the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service, Washington, D.C., October 6, 1966.

Johnson, A. Pemberton. "Some Estimated Effects of the Selective Service Student Deferment Program Upon Law School Enrollments." Talk given at the Round Table Meeting on Admission Procedures at the Annual Meeting of the Association of American Law Schools, Denver, Colorado, December 29, 1951.

Marden, David L. "The Cold War and American Education." 2 vols. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Kansas, 1975.

Tucker, Ledyard R. "The Program of Statistics for the Selective Service College Qualification Test of May-July, 1951." Presented to the Central New Jersey Chapter of the American Statistical Association, March 25, 1952.

Protests Flood Capital On Student Deferment

Suspicion of Special Privilege Group Stirs Draft Hearings Across Land

CONANT AND DODDS ASSAIL DEFERMENT ON STUDENT MARKS

Selective Service Advisers Defend Their Deferment Plan

The Trytten Committee yesterday in effect indorsed the Trytten plan provided only draft deferment for the students, not ex-

GRIS ... ALSO CRITICAL

Harvard and Princeton Heads Charge Truman Policy Sets Up a Privileged Class

CLOSE HOUSE VOTE DUE ON DEFERMENTS

College Program a Key Issue of Draft Bill—Hershey to Testify Tomorrow

By JOHN D. MORRIS
Special to The New York Times.

Service Has ... Exemption Tests

...electromagnetic pencil: The ... are then doubly graded by ... both by machine and by ... the C.E.E.B. tests are ... large number ...

Sunday News

Truman Gives Deferment ... Best Studen...

Educational Testing ... Compiled Draft Exemption ...

Princeton Organization Prepared To Be Given to College Students To Be Basis for Defer...

TRUMAN APPROVES DRAFT DEFERMENT FOR BEST STUDENTS

He Revises Rules So National Test or Class Standing Will Fix Colleges' Status

...'S BARRED

...inations, May 26, U. S.

...NK HOLEMAN
...Bureau
...—President Truman ... the cream of the ...

Discrimination

Unless proposed deferment of colle... are even passably bright is defeated ... opinion, the Selective Service la... cted, as one of the most unju... ced on the nation's stat...

Amendment Okayed by Representatives Would Give Discretion to Local Boards On Use of Aptitude Test for Deferments

The House of Representatives voted yesterday ... college students. The action came on an amendm... but would not make scores on this test binding ...

...ive more power to local draft boards in the deferment of ... ould retain the use of aptitude test for deferments ...

...For Student Deferments

...afayette President in Conflict With Dodds, Conant Views

Special to Newark News.
EASTON, Pa.—Dr. Ralph C. ...tchinson, president of Lafayette ...

House Bars Overseas Draftee Ban; Forbids Blanket Student Deferment

Special to The New York Times.

HERSHEY DEFENDS PLAN

Says Student Program Serves Until Better One Is Offered

Special to The New York Times.
PHILADELPHIA, April 14—

70